

## Original Article

# Prediction of Outcome Based on Trauma and Injury Severity Score, IMPACT and CRASH Prognostic Models in Moderate-to-Severe Traumatic Brain Injury in the Elderly

## Abstract

**Objectives:** This study aimed to evaluate the trauma and injury severity score (TRISS), IMPACT (international mission for prognosis and analysis of clinical trials), and CRASH (corticosteroid randomization after significant head injury) prognostic models for prediction of outcome after moderate-to-severe traumatic brain injury (TBI) in the elderly following road traffic accident. **Design:** This was a prospective observational study. **Materials and Methods:** This was a prospective observational study on 104 elderly trauma patients who were admitted to tertiary care hospital, over a consecutive period of 18 months from December 2016 to May 2018. On the day of admission, data were collected from each patient to compute the TRISS, IMPACT, and CRASH and outcome evaluation was prospectively done at discharge, 14<sup>th</sup> day, and 6-month follow-up. **Results:** This study included 104 TBI patients with a mean age of 66.75 years and with a mortality rate of 32% and 45%, respectively, at discharge and at the end of 6 months. The predictive accuracies of the TRISS, CRASH (computed tomography), and IMPACT (core, extended, laboratory) were calculated using receiver operator characteristic (ROC) curves for the prediction of mortality. Best cutoff point for predicting mortality in elderly TBI patients using TRISS system was a score of  $\leq 88$  (sensitivity 94%, specificity of 80%, and area under ROC curve 0.95), similarly cutoff point under the CRASH at 14 days was score of  $> 35$  (100%, 80%, 0.958); for CRASH at 6 months, best cutoff point was at  $> 84$  (88%, 88%, 0.959); for IMPACT (core), it was  $> 38$  (88%, 93%, 0.976); for IMPACT (extended), it was  $> 27$  (91%, 89%, 0.968); and for IMPACT (lab), it was  $> 41$  (82%, 100%, 0.954). There were statistical differences among TRISS, CRASH (at 14 days and 6 months), and IMPACT (core, extended, lab) in terms of area under the ROC curve ( $P < 0.0001$ ). **Conclusion:** IMPACT (core, extended) models were the strongest predictors of mortality in moderate-to-severe TBI when compared with the TRISS, CRASH, and IMPACT (lab) models.

**Keywords:** Corticoid randomization after significant head injury, elderly, international mission on prognosis and analysis of clinical trials, mortality, trauma and injury severity score, trauma, traumatic brain injury

## Introduction

Traumatic brain injury (TBI) remains the leading cause of death and disability worldwide as well as the most important single injury contributing to traumatic mortality and morbidity.<sup>[1]</sup>

Older age has been recognized as an independent predictor of worse outcome from TBI. Two major factors place older adults at risk for the greater incidence of TBI. First, as one ages, the duramater becomes more adherent to the skull. Second, as part of routine management of chronic conditions, older adults receive

aspirin and anticoagulant therapies. Thus, the mechanisms of injury most likely to be seen in elderly persons increase the risk for TBI. Other normal aging changes include cerebrovascular atherosclerosis and decreased free radical clearance.<sup>[2]</sup>

Establishing an early and reliable prognosis in patients with TBI has proved particularly challenging.<sup>[3,4]</sup> Prognostic models, which generally characterize prognostic research, are statistical models that use two or more variables to calculate the probability of a predefined outcome.<sup>[5]</sup>

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.

For reprints contact: WKHLRPMedknow\_reprints@wolterskluwer.com

**How to cite this article:** Moorthy DG, Rajesh K, Priya SM, Abhinov T, Devendra Prasad KJ. Prediction of outcome based on trauma and injury severity score, IMPACT and CRASH prognostic models in moderate-to-severe traumatic brain injury in the elderly. Asian J Neurosurg 2021;16:500-6.

Submitted: 27-Nov-2020

Revised: 05-Jan-2021

Accepted: 22-Jan-2021

Published: 14-Sep-2021

**Dhoni Ganesh  
Siva Rama  
Krishna Moorthy,  
Krishnappa Rajesh,  
Sarathy Manju  
Priya, Thaminaina  
Abhinov,  
Kalavagunta  
Jyothiswarapillai  
Devendra Prasad**

Department of Emergency  
Medicine, Sri Devraj Urs  
Medical College, Sri Devaraj  
Urs Academy of Higher  
Education and Research, Kolar,  
Karnataka, India

## Address for correspondence:

Dr. Dhoni Ganesh Siva Rama  
Krishna Moorthy,  
Flat No 6, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor,  
K Block, Doctors Quarters,  
Sri Devraj Urs Medical College,  
Tamaka, Kolar - 563 103,  
Karnataka, India.  
E-mail: drkrishna67@gmail.com

## Access this article online

Website: www.asianjns.org

DOI: 10.4103/ajns.AJNS\_512\_20

## Quick Response Code:



### The international mission for prognosis and analysis of clinical trials

The international mission for prognosis and analysis of clinical trials (IMPACT) study is the result of pooled data from eight randomized controlled trials, three observational studies were conducted between 1984 and 1997.<sup>[6,7]</sup>

IMPACT has three levels of complexity, from the simplest core model to the extended and the most complex laboratory model. The core model consists of age, the motor score component of the Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS), and pupillary light reactivity. The addition of hypoxia, hypotension, and head computed tomography (CT) scan characteristics makes up the extended model. For the laboratory model, blood hemoglobin and glucose concentrations are also added [Table 1].<sup>[8]</sup>

#### Six LPs were defined as follows:

LP<sub>core</sub>, mortality =  $-2.55 + 0.275 \times \text{sum score core}$

LP<sub>core</sub>, unfavorable =  $-1.62 + 0.299 \times \text{sum score core}$

LP<sub>extended</sub>, mortality =  $-2.98 + 0.256 \times \text{sum score extended}$

LP<sub>extended</sub>, unfavorable =  $-2.10 + 0.276 \times \text{sum score extended}$

LP<sub>lab</sub>, mortality =  $-3.42 + 0.216 \times \text{sum score lab}$

LP<sub>lab</sub>, unfavorable =  $-2.82 + 0.257 \times \text{sum score core lab}$

Table reproduced from Steyerberg *et al.*, PLoS Medicine 5(8):5165.

### The corticosteroid randomization after significant head injury

The corticosteroid randomization after significant head injury (CRASH) prognostic model is the result of the MRCCrash meta-trial investigating the role of corticosteroids in patients with TBI.<sup>[9]</sup> Like IMPACT, CRASH is based on admission characteristics to predict probabilities of 14-day mortality and 6-month neurological outcome on the GCS. CRASH has two levels of complexity, a basic model and an extended version with CT scan characteristics. The basic model includes age, GCS, pupillary light reaction, and presence of major extracranial injury. CT scan characteristics added for the extended model are the presence of petechial hemorrhage, status of the third ventricle and basal cisterns, presence of traumatic subarachnoid hemorrhage, midline shift, and mass lesion. Moreover, CRASH is calibrated differently for patients from low- and middle-income countries and high-income countries.<sup>[9-12]</sup>

#### Trauma and injury severity scores

Trauma and injury severity score (TRISS) determines the probability of survival (Ps) of a patient from the injury severity score (ISS) and revised trauma score (RTS) using the following formulae:

$$Ps = 1 / (1 + e^{-b})$$

**Table 1: The International Mission for Prognosis and Analysis of Clinical Trials in traumatic brain injury model**

Characteristics	Value	Score	Sum
Age (Years)	<30	0	
	30-39	1	
	40-49	2	
	50-59	3	
	60-69	4	
	>70	5	
Motor Score	None/Extension	6	
	Abnormal Flexion	4	
	Normal Flexion	2	
	Localizes/Obeys	0	
	Untestable/Missing	3	
	Sum score core model		
Pupillary Reactivity	Both Pupils reacted	0	
	One Pupil reacted	2	
	No Pupil reacted	4	
	Sum score core model		
Hypoxia	Yes/Suspected	1	
	No	0	
Hypotension	Yes/Suspected	2	
Ct Classification	No	0	
Traumatic SAH	I	-2	
Epidural Hematoma	II	0	
	III/IV	2	
	V/VI	2	
	Yes	2	
	No	0	
	Yes	-2	
Glucose (Mmol/dl)	No	0	
	Sub score CT		
	Sum Score Extended Model		
	<6	0	
	6-8.9	1	
	9-11.9	2	
	12-14.9	3	
	>15	4	
	HB (gm/dl)		
	<9	3	
HB (gm/dl)	9-11.9	2	
	12-14.9	1	
	>15	0	
	Sub score lab		
	Sum score lab model		

Sum scores can be calculated for the core model (age, motor score, pupillary reactivity), the extended model (core + hypoxia + hypotension + CT characteristics), and a lab model (core + hypoxia + hypotension + CT + glucose + Hb). The probability of 6-month outcome is defined as  $1 / (1 + e^{-LP})$ , where LP refers to the linear predictor in a logistic regression model. CT – Computed tomography; Hb – Hemoglobin; LP – linear predictor in a logistic regression model.

Where “b” is calculated from:

$$b = b_0 + b_1 (\text{RTS}) + b_2 (\text{ISS}) + b_3 (\text{Age Index})$$

The coefficients  $b_0$ – $b_3$  are derived from multiple regression analysis of the major trauma outcome study database. [Table 2]. Age Index is 0 if the patient is below 54 years of age or 1 if 55 years and over.  $b_0$ – $b_3$  are coefficients which are different for blunt and penetrating trauma. If the patient is less aged than 15 years, the blunt coefficients are used regardless of mechanism. The TRISS calculator determines the probability of survival from the ISS, RTS, and patient's age. ISS and RTS scores can be given independently or calculated from their base parameters.<sup>[13]</sup>

TRISS uses a combination of both anatomic and physiologic scoring systems and gives a more accurate probability of survival.


## Materials and Methods

### Inclusion criteria

- (1) Age equal to or older than 60 years
- (2) GCS score  $\leq 12$  on admission.

**Table 2: TRISS coefficient**

	Blunt	Penetrating
$b_0$	−0.4499	−2.5355
$b_1$	0.8085	0.9934
$b_2$	−0.0835	−0.0651
$b_3$	−1.7430	−1.1360



**Graph 1: Receiver operator characteristic curve showing validity of trauma and injury severity score in predicting mortality at discharge**

**Table 3: Demographic profile of subjects in the study (n=104)**

	Count (%)
Age (years)	
60-70	80 (76.9)
71-80	21 (20.2)
>80	3 (2.9)
Sex	
Female	29 (27.9)
Male	75 (72.1)
Intubation	
I	50 (48.1)
N	54 (51.9)
Outcome at discharge	
Discharged	70 (67.3)
Mortality	34 (32.7)
6-month mortality	
Favorable	59 (56.7)
Unfavorable	45 (43.3)

**Table 4: Factors associated with mortality at discharge**

	Total (n=104)	At discharge, count (%)		P
		Discharged	Mortality	
Age (years)				
60-70	80	60 (75)	20 (25)	0.002*
71-80	21	10 (47.6)	11 (51.3)	
>80	3	0 (0)	3 (100)	
GCS				
3	8	0 (0)	8 (100)	<0.001*
4	5	0 (0)	5 (100)	
5	4	0 (0)	4 (100)	
6	3	1 (33.3)	2 (66.6)	
7	8	6 (75)	2 (25)	
8	5	1 (20)	4 (80)	
9	9	4 (54.5)	5 (44.4)	
11	10	9 (90)	1 (10)	
12	52	49 (94.2)	3 (5.7)	
ISS				
1-24	91	70 (76.9)	21 (22.1)	<0.001*
25-75	13	0 (0)	13 (100)	
Pupils				
ER	78	66 (84.6)	12 (15.3)	<0.001*
NR	7	0 (0)	7 (100)	
UR	19	4 (21)	15 (79)	
EDH				
No	81	58 (71.6)	23 (28.4)	0.080
Yes	23	12 (52.1)	11 (47.8)	
SDH				
No	59	45 (76.2)	14 (23.7)	0.026*
Yes	45	25 (55.5)	20 (44.5)	
SAH				
No	45	34 (75.5)	11 (24.5)	0.117
Yes	59	36 (61)	23 (39)	

ISS-Injury severity score; GCS-Glasgow Coma Scale; ER-Equal reactive; NR-Non reactive; UR-Unequally reactive; EDH-Epidural Hemorrhage; SDH-Sub Dural Hemorrhage; SAH-Sub Arachnoid Hemorrhage; \*-0.05

## Exclusion criteria

- (1) Patients discharged against medical advice
- (2) Patients/attendants of patients who were not willing to participate in the study [Figure 1].

**Table 5: Factors associated with mortality at 6 months**

	Total (n=104)	6-month mortality, count (%)		P
		Favourable	Unfavourable	
Age (years)				
60-70	80	49 (61.2)	31 (38.7)	0.07
71-80	21	10 (47.6)	11 (52.4)	
>80	3	0 (0.0)	3 (100)	
GCS				
3	8	0 (0.0)	8 (100)	<0.001*
4	5	0 (0.0)	5 (100)	
5	4	0 (0.0)	4 (100)	
6	3	0 (0.0)	3 (100)	
7	8	0 (0.0)	8 (100)	
8	5	1 (20)	4 (80)	
9	9	2 (22.2)	7 (77.7)	
11	10	9 (90)	1 (10)	
12	52	47 (90.3)	5 (9.6)	
ISS				
1-24	91	59 (64.8)	32 (35.2)	<0.001*
25-75	13	0 (0.0)	13 (100)	
Pupils				
ER	78	59 (75.6)	19 (24.3)	<0.001*
NR	7	0 (0.0)	7 (100)	
UR	19	0 (0.0)	19 (100)	
EDH				
No	81	53 (65.4)	28 (34.6)	0.001*
Yes	23	6 (26)	17 (74)	
SDH				
No	59	34 (57.6)	25 (42.4)	0.833
Yes	45	25 (55.5)	20 (44.5)	
SAH				
No	45	32 (71.1)	13 (28.9)	0.01*
Yes	59	27 (45.7)	32 (54.3)	


ISS-Injury severity score; GCS-Glasgow Coma Scale; ER-Equally reactive; NR-Non reactive; UR-Unequally reactive; EDH-Epidural Hemorrhage; SDH-Sub Dural Hemorrhage; SAH- Sub Arachnoid Hemorrhage; \*-0.05

## Statistical analysis

Data were entered into Microsoft Excel data sheet and were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 22 version software, International Business Machines Corporation (IBM), Armonk, New York. Categorical data were represented in the form of frequencies and proportions. Chi-square test was used as a test of significance for qualitative data. Continuous data were represented as mean and standard deviation. Graphical representation of data: MS Excel and MS Word were used to obtain various types of graphs such as bar diagram, pie diagram, and ROC curve. *P* value (probability that the result is true) of <0.05 was considered as statistically significant after assuming all the rules of statistical tests.

## Results

The prospective observational study included 104 TBI patients with age more than 60 years over a period of




**Graph 2: Receiver operator characteristic curve showing validity of CRASH score in predicting mortality at 14 days**


**Table 6: Performance measures of the prognostic models in predicting mortality**

Model	Criterion	Sensitivity	Specificity	PPV	NPV	AUC	Youden index	P
Mortality at discharge								
TRISS	≤88	94.12	80.00	69.6	96.6	0.95	0.7412	<0.0001
Mortality at 14 days								
CRASH	>35	100.00	80.00	70.8	100.0	0.958	0.8000	<0.0001
Mortality at 6 months								
CRASH	>84	88.24	88.57	78.9	93.9	0.959	0.7681	<0.0001
IMPACT (core)	>38	88.89	93.22	90.9	91.7	0.976	0.8211	<0.0001
IMPACT (extended)	>27	91.11	89.83	87.2	93.0	0.968	0.8094	<0.0001
IMPACT (lab)	>41	82.22	100.00	100.0	88.1	0.954	0.8222	<0.0001


AUC-Area under the curve; PPV-Positive predictive value; NPV-Negative predictive value; TRISS-Trauma and injury severity score; IMPACT-International Mission on Prognosis and Analysis of Clinical Trials; CRASH-Corticoid Randomisation After Significant Head injury




Graph 3: Receiver operator characteristic curve showing validity of CRASH score in predicting mortality at 6 months



Graph 4: Receiver operator characteristic curve showing validity of IMPACT (core) score in predicting mortality at 6 months



Graph 5: Receiver operator characteristic curve showing validity of IMPACT (extended) score in predicting mortality at 6 months




Graph 6: Receiver operator characteristic curve showing validity of IMPACT (lab) score in predicting mortality at 6 months

18 months following road traffic accident. Of the total 80 were in the age group of 60–70 years, 21 were in 70–80 years and only 3 were in more than 80 years. About 72.1% were men ( $n = 75$ ) and 27.9% were women ( $n = 29$ ). Fifty patients had oral intubation following emergency department arrival due to low GCS. Thirty-five had mortality at the time of discharge and 45 at the end of 6 months. Patients' demographic and

clinical characteristics are shown in Table 3. The tested variables such as patients' age, GCS score, pupillary reaction, and the ISS at admission were all significantly associated with mortality at discharge and at the end of 6 months ( $P < 0.0$ ) [Table 4 and 5].

The predictive accuracies of the TRISS, CRASH, and IMPACT were calculated using ROC curves for the prediction of mortality. Best cutoff points for predicting





**Figure 1:** Flow chart depicting research methodology

mortality in elderly TBI patients in TRISS, CRASH at 14 days, CRASH at 6 months, IMPACT (core), IMPACT (extended), and IMPACT (lab) models were  $\leq 88$ ,  $>35$ ,  $>84$ ,  $>38$ ,  $>27$ , and  $>41$  with sensitivity of 94%, 100%, 88%, 88%, 91%, and 82% and specificity of 80%, 80%, 88%, 93%, 89%, and 100%, respectively [Table 6].

The area under the ROC curve was 0.95 in TRISS, 0.958 in CRASH at 14 days, 0.959 in CRASH at 6 months, and 0.976, 0.968, and 0.954 in IMPACT score core, extended, and lab models, respectively, at the end of 6 months [Graphs 2-6]. The Youden index was 0.7412 in TRISS, 0.800 in CRASH at 14 days, 0.7681 in CRASH at 6 months, and 0.8211, 0.8094, and 0.8222 in IMPACT score core, extended, and lab models, respectively, at the end of 6 months. All models showed a good ability to discriminate between survival and death at discharge and at 6 months as indicated by values of area under the curve (AUC) and Youden index [Table 6].

## Discussion

The main aim of the present study was the applicability of TRISS, CRASH, and IMPACT models in the elderly with moderate-to-severe TBI for mortality prediction. In the present study, the AUC for mortality prediction using the TRISS, CRASH (CT), and IMPACT models was 0.95 (TRISS), 0.958 (CRASH at 14 days), 0.959 (CRASH at 6 months), and 0.976, 0.968, and 0.954 (IMPACT core, extended, and lab at 6 months, respectively).

In Maeda *et al.*'s study, the AUC for mortality prediction using the TRISS, CRASH (CT), and IMPACT models was 0.75 (TRISS), 0.86 (CRASH at 6 months), and

0.81 and 0.85 (IMPACT core and extended at 6 months, respectively).<sup>[14]</sup> In Wan *et al.*'s study, the AUC for mortality prediction using the IMPACT core, extended, and lab models was 0.76, 0.76, and 0.73, respectively.<sup>[15]</sup> In Han *et al.*'s study, the AUC for mortality prediction using the CRASH and IMPACT ranged from 0.80 to 0.89.<sup>[11]</sup> Our study results indicates that the AUC for mortality prediction using the TRISS, CRASH (CT), and IMPACT was significantly high when compared with the other studies.

## Conclusion

Our study findings suggest that TRISS, CRASH, and IMPACT models have good values for prediction of mortality in the elderly with moderate-to-severe TBI. However, IMPACT (core and extended) model has maximum prediction in mortality when compared with the other models.

## Financial support and sponsorship

Nil.

## Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts of interest.

## References

1. Fu TS, Jing R, McFaul SR, Cusimano MD. Recent trends in hospitalization and in-hospital mortality associated with traumatic brain injury in Canada: A nationwide, population-based study. *J Trauma Acute Care Surg* 2015;79:449-54.
2. Timiras, P. The nervous system: Structural and biochemical changes. In: Timiras, P, editor. *Physiological Basis of Aging and Geriatrics*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press; 2003. p. 99-118.
3. Hukkelhoven CW, Rampen AJ, Maas AI, Farace E, Habbema JD, Marmarou A, *et al.* Some prognostic models for traumatic brain injury were not valid. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2006;59:132-43.
4. Perel P, Edwards P, Wentz R, Roberts I. Systematic review of prognostic models in traumatic brain injury. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak* 2006;6:38.
5. Steyerberg EW, Moons KG, van der Windt DA, Hayden JA, Perel P, Schroter S, *et al.* Prognosis research strategy (PROGRESS) 3: Prognostic model research. *PLoS Med* 10(2): e1001381.
6. Maas AI, Marmarou A, Murray GD, Teasdale SG, Steyerberg EW. Prognosis and clinical trial design in traumatic brain injury: The IMPACT study. *J Neurotrauma* 2007;24:232-8.
7. Marmarou A, Lu J, Butcher I, McHugh GS, Mushkudiani NA, Murray GD, *et al.* IMPACT database of traumatic brain injury: Design and description. *J Neurotrauma* 2007;24:239-50.
8. Steyerberg EW, Mushkudiani N, Perel P, Butcher I, Lu J, McHugh GS, *et al.* Predicting outcome after traumatic brain injury: Development and international validation of prognostic scores based on admission characteristics. *PLoS Med* 2008;5:e165.
9. MRC CRASH Trial Collaborators, Perel P, Arango M, Clayton T, Edwards P, Komolafe E, *et al.* Predicting outcome after traumatic brain injury: Practical prognostic models based on large cohort

- of international patients. *BMJ* 2008;336:425-9.
10. Wong GK, Teoh J, Yeung J, Chan E, Siu E, Woo P, *et al.* Outcomes of traumatic brain injury in Hong Kong: Validation with the TRISS, CRASH, and IMPACT models. *J Clin Neurosci* 2013;20:1693-6.
11. Han J, King NK, Neilson SJ, Gandhi MP, Ng I. External validation of the CRASH and IMPACT prognostic models in severe traumatic brain injury. *J Neurotrauma* 2014;31:1146-52.
12. Honeybul S, Ho KM, Lind CR, Gillett GR. Validation of the CRASH model in the prediction of 18-month mortality and unfavorable outcome in severe traumatic brain injury requiring decompressive craniectomy. *J Neurosurg* 2014;120:1131-7.
13. Boyd CR, Tolson MA, Copes WS. Evaluating trauma care: The TRISS method. Trauma score and the Injury Severity Score. *J Trauma* 1987;27:370-8.
14. Maeda Y, Ichikawa R, Misawa J, Shibuya A, Hishiki T, Maeda T, *et al.* External validation of the TRISS, CRASH, and IMPACT prognostic models in severe traumatic brain injury in Japan. *PLoS ONE* 14(8): e0221791.
15. Wan X, Zhao K, Wang S, Zhang H, Zeng L, Wang Y, *et al.* Is it reliable to predict the outcome of elderly patients with severe traumatic brain injury using the IMPACT prognostic calculator? *World Neurosurg* 2017;103:584-90.